

## Chapter 4

### Consultation and Coordination





## **CHAPTER 4: CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION**

Park staff place a high priority on meeting the intent of public and interested agency involvement, both internal and external, in the NEPA process. In addition to giving the public an opportunity to comment on proposed actions, regulatory agency comments, interested party comments, and comments from NPS staff familiar with the proposed project were highly encouraged. As part of the NPS NEPA process, issues associated with the action were identified during scoping meetings with NPS staff, coordination with other affected agencies, public meetings, and public comment.

During the development of the EA, the park has actively involved the public in the process. The park's goals for public participation include: acceptance of the EA by the public; substantive and valuable input to help guide park decisions; and minimization of conflicts through dissemination of information and initiating discussion.

The park places a high value on maintaining a meaningful dialogue with interested parties, agencies and organizations. The park elicited public participation in the discussion of alternatives for the EA. Scoping, public and agency involvement efforts included a number of open house meetings, press releases, website posting, and dissemination of information and gathering of comment through the internet.

### **4.1 Scoping Process and Public Involvement**

The NPS divided the scoping process into three categories: internal scoping (NPS staff and individuals working directly on the project), external scoping (public), and agency/organizational scoping (federal and state regulatory agency staff). Internal scoping for this EA involved discussions among the NPS, other federal and state agencies regarding the purpose and need for the project, issues, objectives, management alternatives, mitigation measures, appropriate level of documentation, lead and cooperating agency roles, and other related dialogue.

Public scoping is the early involvement of the interested and affected public in the environmental analysis process. The public scoping process helps ensure that individuals have been given an opportunity to comment and contribute early in the decision-making process.

#### **4.1.1 Internal Scoping**

The purpose of internal NPS scoping activities was to develop a framework for the planning process and the fundamental foundation (e.g., purpose and need for the plan, plan objectives, area of effect) needed to prepare the environmental assessment for the repair or replacement of the failed sheetpile dams in Cape Sable. This scoping supports the planning process by ensuring that the requirements of the NEPA and NPS Director's Order #12 (NPS 2001) would be fulfilled throughout the planning process.

Prior to the internal scoping meeting, NPS ENP and URS staff reviewed the scope of work, assembled a workshop briefing package, and drafted the internal scoping meeting agenda.

A field visit was scheduled for September 18, 2008, but due to weather conditions it was rescheduled for September 30, 2008, and October 9, 2008 (to accommodate all of the participants' schedules). These staff, facilitated by the contractor (URS), worked collectively to:

- Define the purpose and need for action regarding the restoration of the failed sheetpile dams in Cape Sable
- Identify the issues and concerns associated with restoring the failed dams

- Define the objectives of restoring the failed dams
- Discuss and refine the alternatives presented in the 2007 URS report entitled “Cape Sable Canals Engineering Analysis”

The scoping process was implemented by recording individual comments and responses to questions posed by the facilitator. The results of the internal scoping team’s collaborative efforts are presented under the respective headings found in this chapter.

### ***Issues Identified Prior to the Internal Scoping Meeting***

#### Internal Comments

Issues are concerns or topics that need to be considered in the course of developing a successful management strategy that is consistent with governing laws, regulations, and policies and park resources. Issues need to be addressed in the analysis of the proposed management action and its alternatives. Although in some cases the issues may appear repetitive, scoping team members identified subtle differences and asked that all of the following be retained. Prior to the Internal Scoping Meeting, NPS staff identified the preliminary issues which are generally organized by topic, to be addressed in the planning and compliance process. During the Internal Scoping Meeting, the entire project team identified the issues which are generally organized by topic, to be addressed in the EA for the project.

Issues and concerns identified by the participants prior to the internal scoping include:

#### Soils

- Potential impacts to soils including scour and the dredging of large amounts of material necessary for access by construction barges
- Origin of the fill material and the mode of transporting the fill to the dams site necessary for the proposed geotubes restoration alternative

#### Hydrology

- Ramifications of blocking flow at East Cape canal on East Side Creek such as accelerating bank erosion and widening of East Side Creek
- Impacts on hydrology from dredging the canals

#### Vegetation

- Removal and/or trimming of mangroves overhanging the Homestead canal to allow barge traffic to access the existing dam site

#### Marine Resources

- Concerns with dredging to the Homestead canal and the degree to which this would impact benthic resources
- A benthic survey of proposed dredge areas and surrounding lake habitat would be necessary to quantify potential impact to park resources - benthic surveys would also necessary to identify a suitable sand donor site and to identify a shoaling area with the least potential for benthic resource impacts
- Spoil disposal areas may be needed within Lake Ingraham
- BMPS for sedimentation and erosion control would also be incorporated into the Erosion Control Plan for proposed spoil deposition activities - newly created spoil islands may be proposed as mitigation for unavoidable mangrove impacts associated with dam repairs

### Visitor Use and Experience

- Motorboat access upstream of the dams and ensuring restricted access to the remote backcountry after the dams are restored - discussions included the idea that vandals may try to dig a trench around the sheetpile dam or through the earthen dam to create a new breach
- Successful project completion would eliminate motorboat access into the wilderness area via two canals
- Kayak/Canoe Portage must be included with all alternatives

### ***Internal Scoping Meeting Comments***

Several comments and concerns were addressed at the Internal Scoping Meeting which was held on September 19, 2008 at the Krome Center, South Florida Ecosystem office, Homestead, Florida. These comments were addressed in an orderly manner and a conclusion was decided upon prior to moving to the next topic.

### Draft Project Purpose

- The word “repair” should be replaced with the word “restore” and three comments arose regarding “sustainability” and “longevity”

### Draft Project Need

- Several technical comments concerned the wording of the Draft Project Need - suggested wording included mentioning that ethnographic use and value has been diminished due to the dam failures
- Both the preservation of “saltwater intrusion” and the “addition of freshwater” to the system were addressed

### Draft Project Objectives

- Should include a statement that “no harm to marine species is anticipated” (in addition to benefits to other wildlife)
- No adverse affects to cultural resources needs to be mentioned
- Sedimentation and erosion effects should be addressed

### Schedule

- No work would take place during crocodile nesting season from March to September, therefore the project schedule should be accelerated as to meet the scheduling constraints of the crocodile nesting season
- The timeline goal for the project is to begin construction by November 2009 (subsequent to crocodile nesting season) and complete construction by February 2010 (prior to the crocodile nesting season)
- NPS/URS would attempt to accelerate the schedule to meet the constraints of crocodile nesting season.

### Cost

- Cost should be considered in the engineering analysis of the alternatives.

### Mangrove Trimming

- Every alternative other than Alternatives D1 and G1 for the Homestead Canal would require mangrove trimming - mangrove trimming (or removal) would be necessary in the East Cape Extension canal to accommodate the barge
- Mangrove trimming would be necessary for riprap installation

### Dredging

- Every alternative other than Alternatives D1 and G1 for the Homestead Canal would require extensive dredging (of Lake Ingraham) for access purposes - only Alternatives D1 and G1 for the Homestead Canal would be constructed without dredging
- It is important to decide if dredging would be done in the Homestead Canal because it effects the options available for the alternatives.
- The transport of riprap to the site is a concern due to the necessary dredging required to access the site with a sufficiently sized barge - riprap would be airlifted by helicopter as this would be less cost prohibitive than dredging
- If dredging is required, permitting and water quality impact analysis would be necessary that would extend the timeframe of the project - in addition, the dredging would cause a moderate to major impact and would trigger an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), possibly extending the timeframe of the project by at least 1-year due to additional coordination and documentation, particularly with NMFS review of small-toothed sawfish, crocodile nesting, and wading bird impacts
- The possibility exists that deposits near the mouth of the East Cape canal in Florida Bay would restrict barge traffic; however, it is unlikely that dredging would be necessary if barges are brought in at high tide from an offshore location
- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) would require an alternatives impact analysis and typically approves the alternative with the least impacts (i.e. no dredging).
- A wilderness review would be required to be completed for dredging impacts
- Cultural resources would have to be considered in the dredging effort
- The chosen dredging methodology would have an effect on the quantity of impacts
- Dredging should remain an option during the scoping process and be discounted in the EA process if it is found to not be feasible.

### Construction Barge Draft

- There is less than a 2-foot draft at high tide and a mudflat at low tide in the Homestead Canal approach channel in Lake Ingraham
- It is anticipated that if a barge is necessary, a shallow draft push-boat would be utilized for barge propulsion
- All alternatives for construction would take into consideration the shallow depth of the canals.

### Canoe/Kayak Access

- Consider canoe and kayak access with all of the proposed alternatives as the ENP would lose much of the support for this project if canoe/kayak access is not provided across the dams

- It was determined that these paddlers would find a way across the dams even if a safe route was not provided
- The consensus was that a portage of 100-feet would be reasonable access
- A safe canoe/kayak portage would be included as a design element in all of the alternatives during the engineering analysis.

#### Fill Material

- Fill material would consist of either sand brought in by barge or dredge of on-site material - if material is bought into the site, it would be necessary to carefully consider the benthic resources and seed sources from the donor site
- An alternative fill source material which would be utilized is the Hole-in-the-Donut (HID) material - this material would be acceptable from an engineering standpoint, but would require filtering for the removal of large debris before being utilized in geotubes, although raw material from the HID would be considered for use between geotubes and sheetpile
- Ultimately, sand is the preferred material for fill material because it is clean and porous.

#### Park Roads

- Park roads are currently insufficient to handle the high volume and weights experienced for transportation of fill material via heavy trucks from the HID - in order to bring the roads up to a sufficient level to allow for heavy trucks and equipment (new culverts and milling/resurfacing, etc.), it would cost approximately \$5-million dollars.
- Additionally, it would be necessary to determine what effect would occur to the park roads from handling the number/weight of truckloads of material required for fill material to be trucked in for this project.

#### Geotubes

- An acceptable sub-grade for the placement of geotubes (Alternatives D1 and G1) would be required - smaller geotubes may also be required for stabilization of the larger tubes.
- It was determined that the current would be slowed ahead of the construction to allow for placement of the sub-grade and geotubes, but this would expand the work area and the area of impact for the project.
- Geotubes have been used in a variety of other projects with success, but they require protection from hard surface material (i.e. rip-rap) and/or UV degradation from sunlight.
- For the Homestead Canal, the geotubes would be placed at the mouth of the canal and used as a staging area; smaller boats would be utilized to lay piping; geotubes would be pump-filled through the piping; helicopters would be used to drop in rip-rap - the barge would be located at the junction of the Lake Ingraham Canal and Lake Ingraham main channel on the east side or alternatively, near the Middle Cape Canal on the northwest end of Lake Ingraham
- It was determined that geotubes are the only alternative that would not require dredging to construct
- The use of geotubes (or a similar plug structure using sheetpile) would be considered an alternative for both canals

### Weir Structures

- The weir structures do not meet most of the project objectives - a weir structure would create a safety hazard for canoeists/kayakers trying to pass the dams.
- A weir would cause further turbulence of the water increasing erosion of the sediment.
- Engineer options that mitigate turbulence to the greatest extent possible – therefore, the weir structures have been removed from the final alternatives

### Dam Location

- Positioning on the marl ridge or at the mouth of the canal?
- Tidal flow and forces are the driving concerns - tidal waters would redirect through the mangroves on extreme high tides approximately 80 times per year.
- The location the dams should remain along the marl ridge because it is the natural high point and hydrologic divide

### Engineering Alternatives

- The discussion noted a potential erosion rate of 2 to 4 feet of canal width per year.
- Restoring the dams at their present locations (with geotubes, sheetpiling, or by other means) would leave an open reach of canal on the Florida Bay side of the dams - while tidal flows in these open reaches should be reduced, there would remain tidal influences that potentially would cause bank erosion and ultimately, failure of the restored dams.
- In order to eliminate erosion on the Florida Bay side of the dams, flow would have to be eliminated or substantially reduced - consideration should be given to stemming, or halting the flow of water at the mouths of the canals
- Because the marl ridge is located north of the canal mouths, relocating the dams to the mouths would cause other problems - therefore, consideration should be given to blocking/stemming tidal flow at the canal mouths, and restoring the dams at their present locations - this option would be less expensive than the 'real' fix to the problem, which would be to fill the canals from the canal mouths to the marl ridge.
- It was decided that three new alternatives and a no-build alternative would be evaluated in the EA - type and placement of riprap would also be considered with all alternatives.

#### **4.1.2 Public Scoping**

A project scoping newsletter was distributed to approximately 2,000 individuals, organizations, agencies, and American Indian Tribes by U.S. mail and electronic mail in September 2008 (see Appendix C). This notice announced the Park's proposal and described preliminary alternative and resource considerations, and identified opportunities for public participation in the EA process. The notice invited interested parties to submit their initial views or concerns regarding the project to the park. The scoping period was scheduled from September 24 through October 23, 2008.

The purpose of the Public Scoping Meeting was to solicit input from the community and stakeholders on the project purpose, need, and objectives; to identify issues and concerns to be addressed in the EA; and to receive comments on potential alternatives for restoring the failed dams on the East Cape and Homestead Canals. The public meeting included numerous methods for the community to provide comment. Each of the information stations had a flip chart where an assigned person would take comment on that particular topic, or any other topic on



which the community member had concerns or questions. If the commenter did not want to make comments at the stations, a table was provided at the meeting with comment sheets that would be filled out and returned. If the attendee chose not to fill out the comment sheet at the meeting, a return address was provided on the sheet to mail back to the park at a later date. Those attending the meeting were also directed to the EA newsletter, which provided additional opportunities for comment on the project, including directing comments to the NPS's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) website at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/ever>.

A Public Scoping Meeting was held on October 8, 2008, at the South Dade Regional Library in Miami, Florida to initiate public involvement early in the planning stage and to obtain community feedback regarding the initial concepts for the development of the Cape Sable Canals Dam Restoration EA. A total of 15 public participants and 15 project personnel attended.

### ***Methodology***

During the comment period, 49 pieces of correspondence were received with 102 comments. Correspondence was received by one of the following methods: email, telephone, hard copy letter via mail, or entered into the PEPC website. Letters received by email or through the postal mail, as well as the flip chart comment from the public meeting, were entered into the PEPC system for analysis. Each of these letters or submissions is referred to as correspondence.

#### **4.1.3 Scoping Comments**

##### ***Summary of Public Comments***

Respondents were overwhelmingly (>97%) in favor of the project and many respondents were concerned about the dams not being restored sooner. The comments in opposition to the project were concerned mainly about the cost, longevity, and sustainability of the project, arguing that sea level rise would negate the benefit of the investment, that the project lacked funding due to federal budget constraints, and that other pressing Everglades restoration needs exist. The comments, concerns, and suggestions of the respondents fell into several categories including range of alternatives, environmental impacts, socio-cultural impacts, historic/archaeological impacts, the cost/benefit value of the project, and visitor use and experience.

Correspondence from agencies included letters and comments from the following agencies with the number of correspondences denoted in parentheses: National Park Service (4), Florida Department of Environmental Protection (3), South Florida Regional Planning Council (2), Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (2), Florida State University (1), State Historic Preservation Officer (1), South Florida Water Management District (1), Florida Department of State (1), and Florida International University (1). Correspondence from organizations included letters and comments from the following organizations with the number of correspondences denoted in parentheses: National Parks Conservation Association (1), Florida Biodiversity Project (1), Sierra Club (1), Florida Keys Fishing Guides Association (1), Shallow Water Angler and Florida Sportsman Magazines (1), Audubon Society of Florida (1).

Correspondence from 27 individuals with no affiliation was also received, totaling 49 pieces of correspondence containing 102 comments. The attached appendices show these comments organized by substantive, and non-substantive, and are indexed by organization type and code.

##### ***Public Scoping Meeting Comments***

###### **Project Need**

- The project had two comments pertaining to the actual need for the project; both of the comments are positive due to the benefits to the ecosystem and the enhancement and

enjoyment of park visitors which would come from the corrective action of replacing the dam. One comment, although positive warned of the ecological fragility of the area and requested that no damage be done due to the highly unique nature of the project area.

#### Objectives

- There was some concern as programming the benefits to Lake Ingraham as an objective. The one comment expressed that there was no benefit to Lake Ingraham from the proposed options.

#### No Action Alternative

- There were two comments received concerning the NPS considering the selection of the no action alternative. Comments ranged from expressing concern over the NPS allowing for natural cycles to occur rather than fighting nature with sea level rise and allowing for species and the area to evolve in response to these natural forces. In addition, due to erosion from hurricanes a comment expresses concerns that the project would be a waste of money if a large hurricane comes ashore in the area or sea level rise would completely wipe the area out, including the project. The idea of leaving the area alone, or as is, was expressed.

#### Range of Alternatives/Potential New Alternatives

- Comments were received stating that the NPS should consider a reasonable range of alternatives (per NEPA requirements) and should ultimately consider completely filling the canals.

#### Action Alternatives – Infrastructure and Materials

- Comments were received concerning a range of materials and infrastructure should be taken into consideration. As per comments received, geotubes appear to be cost effective way minimally invasive way to do the job, including fully evaluating riprap, sheetpile and fill material for costs and erosion control.

#### Action Alternatives – Methodology

- Comments pertaining to the construction/repair of dams, maintenance and monitoring should be minimally intrusive on park resources and wilderness character. According to one comment, time has proven that neither earthen dams nor sheet piling work particularly well, money would be well spent building new geotube dams downstream from the current locations. As part of the NEPA process, any and all best practices, lessons learned, and general project information from other recent canal restoration projects should be made available and used to inform the decision-making, as part of the NEPA process, for this Cape Sable Canals Dam Restoration Projects. In addition, dredging should be avoided to bring equipment in. Lastly, all possible measures to avoid damaging habitat and impacting the associated wildlife should be made.

#### Alternatives – Longevity/Sustainability

- Comments were received concerning the ability of the alternatives to survive multiple hurricanes for the next 50 years should be a critical factor in selecting the preferred alternative.

#### Alternatives – Cost

- Comments were received pertaining to NPS to balance the cost/benefit of pursuing this project. Comments pertained to the project not necessarily pursuing the most economical alternative as it may not be the most long lasting. The most cost effective

and financially feasible options should be on the project short list (including sheetpile and geotube alternatives). One comment stated that the project should not be pursued as tax dollars would be utilized in other areas which may need the money more.

### ***Issues/Environmental Impacts to be Addressed in the Environmental Assessment***

#### Noise

- The term “noise” should not be used - while it is absolutely appropriate that the project intends to study the effects of noise on the park, if the intent of this bulleted list is to identify resource impact areas, the commenter suggests another term be used in place of "noise" - under the NPS *Management Policies 2006* (4.9 Natural Soundscape), the "natural soundscape" is recognized as the resource that NPS is working to protect from the adverse effects of noise.

#### Water Quality

- The project should help prevent saltwater intrusion into the freshwater and freshwater marshes

#### Special Status Species

- Limit saltwater intrusion for the freshwater species to thrive.

#### Wildlife and Habitat

- NPS has the responsibility to coordinate with regulatory agencies and has responsibility to protect habitat.
- All subsequent environmental documents must be reviewed to determine the project's continued consistency with the FCMP
- The State's continued concurrence with the proposal would be based, in part, on the adequate resolution of issues identified during this and subsequent reviews
- The state's final review, of the project's consistency with the FCMP would be conducted during the environmental permitting stage

#### Essential Fish Habitat

- The NPS should consider impacts of alternatives to fish habitats - motorboats should not be accessible past the dam as to avoid fish, wildlife habitat and commercial fisheries

#### Wilderness

- Adverse impacts to the canals have to be analyzed in relation to wilderness - the canals act as a conduit for pollutants, exotics and recreational access into wilderness

#### Cultural Resources

- The history of the canals should be documented as the Cape Sable area is a historic area
- The canals should not be completely backfilled as to leave a remnant “ghost” canal
- The canals may be considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places

#### Climate / High Tide Events / Sea Level Rise

- Analyze the impacts of sea level rise on the various alternatives
- Take into consideration the impacts of major storms on the various alternatives

### Visitor Use and Experience

- Enhancement of canoe and kayak use of the area - opportunities for visitors to experience the area in non-motorized vessels are greatly diminished by illegal motorized use and by the rapidly degrading fishery
- Provide canoe/kayak portage over the restored dams
- Prevent motorboats from going inland from the dams into wilderness area
- Maintain dams and provide access to the dams as a place for people to fish in the canals
- It is imperative that the dams stop any boats with motors from passing and that fishermen would come ashore on the dam to fish – the dams are a unique opportunity to fish in remote place from the safety of shore
- Construction should withstand human impact of walking and fishing
- Waste disposal and a port-o-potty would be huge improvements and encourage visiting and frequent fishermen to use the park for recreation
- The design plan should look at/incorporate a mooring/tie-off point for boats & either at the mouth or on/near sheetpile
- A backcountry chickee/campsite in the interior from there would be great, maybe even re-open the site at Gator Lake – the old site is virtually underwater, hidden by trees and therefore mosquito infested.
- Human safety has to be taken into consideration - the dam failures are responsible for creating dangerous currents and have precipitated human safety and navigational problems - immediate corrective measures need to be taken

### Research and Monitoring

- Research should be conducted to establish a baseline of the existing habitats and aquatic animals
- Prior to beginning any project to block saltwater intrusion, a survey of habitats and aquatic animals should be carried out to provide a baseline against which changes resulting from dams would be measured
- After dams are in place a few years, follow-up surveys to measure success in preventing saline intrusion by examining flora and fauna should be funded/conducted.

## **4.2 Agency and Tribal Consultation**

An agency scoping meeting was held on November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008 at the Krome Center, South Florida Ecosystem office, Homestead, Florida. The purpose of the meeting was to initiate agency response in the early planning stage of the proposed project and obtain feedback regarding the initial concepts for development of the Cape Sable Canals Dam Restoration EA. A total of five agencies and the associated staff partook in the meeting.

### **4.2.1 Congressional Representatives**

No comments were received by congressional representatives.

#### 4.2.2 Federal Agencies

**Shelley Norton, NMFS Special Status Species:** NMFS would comment on the EA, and Section 7 consultation would be initiated through the submittal of the EA during the public comment period. NMFS would need specific details before comment. The list of species is accurate, unless there are issues with the donor site (whales, acropora). Section 7 and Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) consultations would be separate. Section 7 consultation considers direct and indirect impacts to species and critical habitat (NMFS only has jurisdiction in water) - adverse and beneficial. No critical habitat for sea turtles is found within the project area. Hopper dredges do have the potential to affect sea turtles. Impacts to seagrass affect foraging habitats for many species. Boat traffic concerns during construction - include boat size, number of trips, and speed. It is suggested that during construction the contractors follow the Seaturtle and Smalltooth Sawfish Construction Conditions (these would be found on NMFS website) - should cover direct species effects. Final rule anticipated by September 2009, so this would likely be in place during permitting. Juvenile habitat: 1) Red mangroves; 2) Eurohaline waters; and 3) Water depth less than 3 ft (permanently). Early coordination would help expedite process. Area of potential effect includes project area, access area, and area directly and indirectly affected by project. It would be beneficial to submit the internal agency review draft to NMFS to begin review/questions, but the public review draft would be required for comments. No mitigation for ESA - goal is to minimize impacts. Mitigation is for EFH.

**Jocelyn Karaszia (West Palm Office): NMFS Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Consultation:** Ms. Karaszia would be the NMFS contact for EFH consultation. EFH consultation does not require legal review, so it may not take as long (as Section 7 consultation).

**Albert Gonzalez, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:** Include cubic yards to be dredged and spoil disposal plan; quantify impact areas and define benefits. Need specific information to determine which type of permit it would qualify. This would depend on location and impacts. The process would be easier if similar location - replacement/restoration. Nationwide permits are usually issued within 60 days, depending on ESA Section 7 consultation (no public notice). Standard permits are usually issued within 120 days, depending on ESA Section 7 consultation (21-day public notice). Corps would forward information to NMFS for ESA Section 7 consultation. The USACE would not issue a permit until South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) issues 401 permit (water quality), but park would submit application.

**USFWS: Section 7 Consultation:** No comments were received from the USFWS to date, however additional coordination is anticipated with the USFWS during the public comment period.

#### 4.2.3 American Indian Tribes

A letter from Willard Steele, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer with the Seminole Tribe of Florida, dated October 16, 2008 (please refer to Appendix B) was received stating the Tribe is awaiting further correspondence from Everglades National Park for consultation.

#### 4.2.4 State of Florida Agencies

Ron Peekstok, South Florida Water Management District: A SFWMD Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) would most likely be required, either Standard General (< 1 acre) or Individual (> 1 acre), depending on size. Since it is a restoration project the application fee would probably be only \$100. Timeline: approximately 6-8 months (more complete application = less time). SFWMD might be able to issue permit based on schematic design if it includes enough detail. Quantify impacts and types - separate temporary and permanent - use UMAM. Also include benefits; barge routes from nearest navigable channel; restoration plan and timeframe (include

monitoring). Consider manatee issues and turbidity management and monitoring - monitoring would be required during construction - twice/day, no more than 4 hours apart at different tides. Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) guidelines are a good example. Mangrove clearing should be addressed through this permitting process (may be exempt if previously authorized by FDEP). Include any exotics removal - may be mitigation.

#### **4.2.5 Local Government Agencies**

No local government comments were received.

#### **4.3 List of Preparers and Contributors**

DeWitt Smith, Oceanographer, Project Manager, NPS, Everglades National Park

Mike Savage, Civil Engineer, NPS, Everglades National Park

Brien Culhane, Chief, Planning and Compliance, NPS, Everglades National Park

Abby Porter, Environmental Protection Specialist, NPS, Everglades National Park

Dan Kimball, Superintendent, NPS, Everglades National Park

Keith Whisenant, Deputy Superintendent, NPS, Everglades National Park

Patrick Malone, Natural Resources Specialist, Project Manager, NPS, Denver Service Center

Tom Murphy, Project Manager, NPS, Denver Service Center

Matt Kutch, Project Specialist, NPS, Denver Service Center

Al O'Mara, Contract Specialist, NPS, Denver Service Center

David Hallac, Biologist, NPS, Everglades National Park

Melissa Memory, Chief of Cultural Resources, NPS, Everglades National Park

Jimi Sadle, Botanist, NPS, Everglades National Park

Mark Parry, Wildlife Biologist, NPS, Everglades National Park

Sonny Bass, Supervisory Wildlife Biologist, NPS, Everglades National Park

Dan Levy, Project Manager, URS Corporation

Thomas Mullen, Design Engineer, URS Corporation

Keith Stannard, Ecological Program Manager, URS Corporation

Lilian Maggi, Senior Environmental Scientist, URS Corporation

Valerie Chartier, Environmental Scientist, URS Corporation

Michael Breiner, Wildlife Biologist, URS Corporation

Irving Day, Environmental Scientist, URS Corporation

Damon Quesenberry, GIS Specialist, URS Corporation

Theodore Murray, QA/QC, URS Corporation

Babu Madabhushi, Engineer, URS Corporation

Edward Marks, Geologist, URS Corporation

Michael Scinta, Construction Engineer, URS Corporation

Orlando Harris, CADD Operator, URS Corporation

#### **4.4 List of Recipients of the EA**

The following federal, state, local, and tribal government agencies and organizations have been sent a copy of this EA. In addition, elected officials, libraries, individuals, businesses, organizations, media outlets, and other groups that have expressed interest in Everglades National Park in the past have been sent letters stating that this EA is available for review and comment.

##### Federal Agencies

National Park Service  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
U.S. Geological Survey  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration - National Marine Fisheries Service

##### State Agencies

Florida Department of Transportation  
Florida Department of Environmental Protection  
South Florida Water Management District  
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission  
Florida State Historic Preservation Office

##### Local Agencies

Monroe County

##### Tribes

Miccosukee Tribe  
Seminole Tribe  
Seminole Nation of Oklahoma

##### Organizations

National Parks Conservation Association  
Audubon Society  
Sierra Club  
Florida Sportsman